Appl. No. 10/787,302

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Information Disclosure Statement

With reference to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 01/04/2008, the Examiner indicates that Document No. US-2003/186716 is incorrect. The Examiner assumes that the document number should be US-2003/0186716. Applicant advises that the Examiner's assumption is correct. Seeing as though the Examiner now cites this document (i.e. Dorenbosch) against the present application, Applicant assumes that there is no need to file another Information Disclosure Statement in order to cite Dorenbosch with the correct document number.

Claim Amendments

Claim 13 has been amended to define how the dispatch network is adapted to "provide the user-device set of at least one provisioned talkgroup identifier upon an event other than talkgroup opt in". This serves to remind the user about each talkgroup that has been provisioned for the user device at some time after the talkgroups are provisioned for the user device, as a user may have forgotten which talkgroup are provisioned for the user device. The application as originally filed provides examples for the "event other than talkgroup opt in" thereby supporting this claim amendment. Examples for the event include a request from the user device—see dependent claims 15 and 17, power on of the user device—see dependent claim 16, and change in the provisioned talkgroup identifier(s)—see dependent claim 19. Clearly these events are different from talkgroup opt in.

Claims 25 and 26 have been cancelled.

New claims 27 and 28 are presented for consideration by the Examiner. These claims are supported by the application as originally filed for similar reasons provided above in respect of claim 13.

6

Appl. No. 10/787,302

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 5, 13-14, 20-21 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0186716 ("Dorenbosch"). In response, Applicant provides the following rebuttal.

<u>Claim 1</u>

The present application is concerned with the problem of informing users of talk groups that are provisioned, typically at the time of service activation, but that the user is unaware of or may have forgotten. Applicant notes that there may be a plurality of talk groups provisioned for the user device. A problem that Applicant has recognized is that the user may forget which talkgroups are provisioned for the user device. Accordingly, the user device is operable to "make information pertaining to the provisioned talkgroup identifiers available to a user of the user device" as recited in claim 1. This allows the user to be reminded of each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device.

Turning now to Dorenbosch, it can be seen that a completely different problem and solution is disclosed. Dorenbosch teaches in Paragraph [0004] that "A problem exists with dispatch calls in that a user is limited to establishing dispatch calls only with members of pre-established groups. As such, a subscriber unit (i.e., a communication device) cannot dynamically establish a group communication. Therefore, a need exists for a method and apparatus for dynamically establishing a talk group within a communication system." Thus, Dorenbosch is concerned with dynamically establishing a talk group within the communication system. With reference to Figure 2, Dorenbosch teaches a solution in Paragraph [0024] in which "the user of remote unit 114 can point remote unit 114 at specific nearby remote units to include them in the group. For example, the user can point the infra-red or BLUETOOTH link of unit 114 at the infra-red port of unit 113 and can thus add unit 113 to a group, while avoiding the addition of unit 115." Dorenbosch goes on to teach in Paragraph [0024] that "Regardless of how the remote unit obtains the call participants, controller 207 ends up with a list of remote units that it desires to place in a talk group." Thus, Dorenbosch teaches how one or more remote units can be dynamically added to the talk group. However, dynamically adding remote units to a talk

7

Appl. No. 10/787,302

group is completely different from reminding a user of each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device.

Dorenbosch goes on to teach in Paragraph [0025] that "the user's unit would present a list of identities of nearby units it has obtained via the user interface 209." This is so that the user can remove those identities from the list that it does not want to include in the group. Note that presenting identities of nearby units is completely different from making information pertaining to the provisioned talk group identifiers available to a user of the user device as in the present application. In particular, displaying the list of identities of nearby units would not remind the user of each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device.

Dorenbosch goes on to teach details of how mobile units opt in the talk group in Paragraph [0026]. In particular, Dorenbosch teaches that "The exchange of messages between base station and the units of the participants that opt in can also be used to forward information in those units that identifies the new or modified group." Applicant appreciates that the information may consist of a "group identifier", but this is not to remind the user of each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device. Rather, the mobile unit is obtaining the talk group identifier upon joining the talk group. In any case, Dorenbosch provides no hint or suggestion that the mobile unit will "make information pertaining to the provisioned talk group identifiers available to a user of the user device". In particular, even though Dorenbosch discuses a user interface, Dorenbosch does not provide any hint or suggestion that the user interface is used for making information pertaining to the provisioned talk group identifiers available to a user of the user device. Moreover, there is no apparent need in Dorenbosch to remind the user about the talk group at the time the talk group has been joined, as the user will not have forgotten about the talk group at the time it is joined.

Dorenbosch goes on to teach details of group calling in Paragraph [0027]. However, there is no teaching whatsoever that a mobile unit is configured to "make information pertaining to the provisioned talkgroup identifiers available to a user of the user device" as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Since Dorenbosch is concerned with a completely different problem, with no consideration whatsoever as to whether a user may forget which talk groups are provisioned for a user device, it is not surprising that Dorenbosch provides no disclosure for

8

Appl. No. 10/787,302

a user device that is configured to "make information pertaining to the provisioned talk group identifier available to a user of the user device" as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 of the present application is patentable over Dorenbosch.

Claims 2 and 5

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2 and 5 are patentable over Dorenbosch for at least the reasons provided above in respect of claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant notes that dependent claim 5 depends from clam 4, which the Examiner concedes to be novel over the disclosure of Dorenbosch. Therefore, the Examiner should similarly consider dependent claim 5 to be novel over Dorenbosch.

Claim 13

Claim 13 as amended defines how the dispatch network is adapted to "provide the user-device set of at least one provisioned talkgroup identifier upon an event other than talkgroup opt in". This serves to remind the user about each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device at some time after the talk groups are provisioned for the user device, as a user may have forgotten which talk group are provisioned for the user device. As noted above, Dorenbosch does not provide talk group identifiers for reminding a user which talk groups are provisioned for the user device. Rather, Dorenbosch teaches that the group identifier for a talk group is provided to a user device upon talk group opt in—see Paragraph [0026]. Providing the group identifier at the time the talk group is joined does not serve to remind the user about each talk group that has been provisioned for the user device. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 13 as amended is patentable over Dorenbosch.

Claim 14

Applicant submits that dependent claim 14 is patentable over Dorenbosch for similar reasons provided above in respect of claim 13.

9

Appl. No. 10/787,302

Claims 20

Claim 20 recites "making the provisioned talkgroup identifiers available to a user of the user device". As noted above for claim 1, Dorenbosch does not teach this subject matter. For this reason alone, Applicant submits that claim 20 is patentable over Dorenbosch.

Furthermore, claim 20 recites "the dispatch network receiving the request and responding with a response containing a user-device specific set of at least one provisioned talk group identifier having a respective provisioned talkgroup identifier for each talkgroup provisioned for the user device". Therefore, claim 20 defines how the user-device specific set of at least one provisioned talk group identifier is provided to the user device upon request for the user-device specific set of at least one provisioned talk group identifier. By contrast, Dorenbosch teaches that a mobile unit receives a group identifier upon talk group opt in—see Paragraph [0026]. Dorenbosch is silent to the mobile unit specifically requesting the group identifier. Note that the user in Dorenbosch would not need to request the group identifier due to forgetting that the talk group is provisioned for the mobile unit, as this all occurs during talk group opt in.

Claims 21, 23 and 24

Applicant submits that dependent claims 21, 23 and 24 are patentable over Dorenbosch for similar reasons provided above in respect of claim 20.

Claims 25 and 26

The Examiner's rejection to claims 25 and 26 is rendered moot, as these claims have been cancelled.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C 103

The Examiner rejects the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorenbosch in view of other prior art. The Examiner's rejection of these claims appear to rely on the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). However, seeing as though the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn, Applicant submits that the rejection of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should similarly be withdrawn.

10

Appl. No. 10/787,302

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Favorable consideration is requested.

<div align="right">
Respectfully submitted,

PADAKANDLA KRISHNA RAO

By _____
Paul den Boef
Reg. No. 62,415
Tel.: (613) 232-2486
</div>

Date: June 27, 2008

PDB:mcg

11